



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|--|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/718,929 | 11/19/2003 | Karl Guthrie | P 6040.13006 | 3155 |
| 74310 | 7590 | 06/05/2008 | EXAMINER | |
| Portland Intellectual Property, LLC 900 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 1820 Portland, OR 97204 | | | LUGO, CARLOS | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | | |
| | | 3673 | | |
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | | | |
| 06/05/2008 | PAPER | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/718,929 | GUTHRIE ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Carlos Lugo | 3673 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Carlos Lugo. (3) _____.

(2) Garth Janke. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 03 June 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 34-61 and 63-70.

Identification of prior art discussed: 5702218, 3332118, 4615514.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In a telephone interview with Mr. Janke, the office action mailed on May 15, 2008 was discussed. The applicant argues that Onofrio device is not used for fall protection, based on the fact that for fall protection, the embodiments requires flexible cables not threaded rods. Also, the applicant propose to incorporate language regarding the hole plug in order to overcome the rejection.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Carlos Lugo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3673
Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.